

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 12, 2007 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 1-53 and 55 have been rejected.

1. Objections to The Claims

In the Office action claim 1 was objected to due to the inclusion of the word "said". Appropriate amendments have been made. It is believed that claim 1 comports with the practices and procedures of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

2. Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Office action claim 29 was rejected as allegedly failing to provide sufficient antecedent bases for limitations recited therein. Appropriate amendments have been made. It is believed that claim 29 comports with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph.

3. Rejection under U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 16, 29 and 41 were rejected as defining inventions that are alleged to be obvious over United States patent number 7,130,669 to Moon in view of United States patent publication number 2002/0072395 to Miramontes. Applicants have amended claim 1 to define the invention as including, *inter alia*, a second body having opposed ends, a recess disposed between, and spaced-apart from, the opposed ends, with a first portion of a keyboard disposed within the recess; and third body including a number pad and pivotally attached to move with respect to the second body to reveal the first portion and a second portion of the keyboard, with a first body being pivotally attached to move with respect to the second body to reveal the display screen and the number pad.

None of the cited prior art references include these features either alone or in combination. Specifically, none of the cited prior art references teach the second body having a

recess, spaced apart from opposed ends of the second body, with a first portion of the keyboard being disposed within the recess. As shown in the marked-up drawings, attached hereto as an EXHIBITS 1 and 2, recess R, is formed between two spaced-apart ends E<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>2</sub> of second body B<sub>2</sub>. See EXHIBIT 2. A first portion P<sub>1</sub> of a keyboard, shown in the EXHIBIT 1, is present in recess R. None of the cited prior art references teach these features. Without the prior art teaching these features, alone or in combination, the prior art does not suggest the invention defined by claim 1. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 1, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 16 to define the invention as including, *inter alia*, a second body having opposed ends, a recess disposed between, and spaced-apart from, the opposed ends, with a first portion of a keyboard disposed within the recess. It is submitted that based upon these features the arguments set forth above with respect to amended claim 1 apply with equal weight here. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 16, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 29 to define the invention as including, *inter alia*, a second body having opposed ends, a recess disposed between, and spaced-apart from, the opposed ends, with a first portion of a user interface disposed within the recess. It is submitted that based upon these features the arguments set forth above with respect to amended claim 1 apply with equal weight here. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 29, as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 41 to define the invention as including, *inter alia*, a second body having opposed ends, with a recess formed between the opposed ends and a first input interface disposed within the recess thereon. It is submitted that based upon these features

the arguments set forth above with respect to amended claim 1 apply with equal weight here.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 41, as amended.

4. Dependent Claims

Considering the dependent claims include all of the features of the independent claims from which they depend, the dependent claims are patentable to the extent that the independent claims are patentable. As a result, Applicants respectfully contend that a *prima facie* case of neither anticipation nor obviousness is present with respect to the dependent claims for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

5. Relief Requested

It is respectfully requested that the claims be examined and in view of the amendments and remarks made above. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12 December 2007



Kenneth C. Brooks  
Reg. No. 38,393

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040